

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. In the above referenced Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 6-7, 11, 13-15, 18-22, and 31-33 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,873); claims 8-10, 16, 17, 28, and 34-35 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,873) in view of Official Notice; claim 23 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,873) in view of Basawapatna et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,598,231); claims 4, 24, 36, 38 and 41-48 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,873) in view of Hodge (US 20010005908); claims 12 and 30 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,873) in view of Hartley (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,414); and claims 67-68, 72-73, and 75-79 over Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,873) in view of Hoarty (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,661). In addition, claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite and claim 36 was objected to based on informalities. Claims 49-51 and 53-66 have been allowed. Claims 5, 25, 39-40 and 71 have been objected to.

Claims 1, 3-25, 28, 30-36, 38-51, and 53-79 are currently pending in this application. Claims 3, 36 and 67-68 been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant thanks the Examiner for favorable treatment of claims 5, 25, 39-40, 49-51, 53-66 and 71. The rejections above have been traversed and, as such, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the allowability of claims 1, 3-25, 28, 30-36, 38-48, and 67-79.

2. Claim 3 was rejected as being dependent upon cancelled claim 2. Claim 3 has been amended to depend from claim 1. For this reason, Applicant believes that claim 3 has been corrected and respectfully requests that this basis for rejection be withdrawn.

3. Claim 36 was rejected based on informalities that have been amended per Examiner's suggestion. For this reason, Applicant believes that claim 36 has been corrected and respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

4. As discussed above claim 1 was rejected based on Williams. Claim 1 recites:

"processing the plurality of channel selection requests to produce the plurality of channel selection commands, wherein the each of the plurality of channel selection commands includes at least one of: last channel selection command, next channel selection command, previous channel selection command, favorite channel selection command, and select channel from user define list."

Examiner has indicated that Williams includes a last channel selection command based on the "latest channel selection request". Williams teaches the selection of a new channel, but Williams does not teach the selection of a new channel based on the last channel. For instance, if a user of the Williams system changes the channel from channel 7 to channel 9, the user cannot issue a last channel selection command to automatically return to channel 7. The user must, instead, remember that he or she

was watching channel 7 and manually select channel 7. Williams does not disclose, suggest or teach a channel selection command that includes a last channel selection command.

For this reason, Applicant believes that claim 1 and claims 3-20 that depend therefrom, are patentably distinct from the prior art.

5. As discussed above, Claim 21 was rejected based on Williams. In rejecting claim 21, the Examiner stated that, "it is noted that a header field and data field are inherently included in a packet" and, "since the packetizer 58 packetizes the selected channel data, the header field inherently includes service channel ID". Applicant disagrees. There is simply no basis for Examiner to assume that Williams service channel ID must be included in the header field of a data packet. Applicant respectfully submits that Williams does not disclose, suggest or teach, either expressly or inherently, that location of this data in the header field.

For this reason, Applicant believes that claim 21 and claims 22-25, 28, and 30-35 that depend therefrom, are patentably distinct from the prior art.

Similarly, Applicant believes that claims 11, 43 and 73 are allowable for this same reason.

6. As discussed above, Claim 36 was rejected based on Williams in view of Hodge. Claim 36 recites in part,

"the bus interface module including a receiving module that is operably coupled to monitor packets on a shared bus and to identify at least one of the packets that contains at least a portion of one of the plurality of channel selection commands to produce an identified packet."

While Examiner cites Hodges for its shared bus 120. However, Hodges does not disclose, suggest or teach monitoring packets on the shared bus to identify at least one of the packets that contains at least a portion of one of the plurality of channel selection commands to produce an identified packet.

For this reason, Applicant believes that claim 36, and claims 38-48 that depend therefrom, are patentably distinct from the prior art.

Similarly, Applicant believes that claims 4, 24, and 70 are allowable for this same reason.

7. As discussed above, claim 67 was rejected based on Williams in view of Hoarty. Claim 67 has been amended to include the following:

"receiving, from a plurality of clients, a plurality of channel selection requests; and
processing the plurality of channel selection requests to determine whether the request can be supported,

and, if so, producing a plurality of channel selection
commands"

Neither Williams nor Hoarty teaches this particular feature.

For this reason, Applicant believes that claim 67, and claims 68-79 that depend therefrom, are patentably distinct from the prior art.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant believes that claims 1, 3-25, 28, 30-36, 38-48, and 67-79 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that they be passed to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present invention.

No additional fee is due. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that are required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1835

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: /Bruce E. Stuckman reg. 36,693/
Bruce E. Stuckman
Phone: (512) 241-8444
Fax No. (512) 241-8445

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

37 C.F.R 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Alexandria, Virginia 22313, on the date below:

06/12/2006
Date


Signature